DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 512 JC 790 620

TITLE Institutional Research, Fiscal Year 1979: Evaluations. Research Monographs II, IV, VII, X, and XIV.

INSTITUTION South Oklahoma City Junior Coll., Okla.

PUB DATE 79

NOTE 31p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Building Design; Classroom Design; Classrooms; College Buildings; College Role; Community Colleges; Educational Innovation; Facility Utilization Research; *Institutional Research; *Junior Colleges; Nontraditional Students; *Program Evaluation; School Schedules; *School Surveys; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes; Use Studies; Weekend Programs; Workshops

ABSTRACT

Of the 14 institutional research projects undertaken at South Oklahoma City Junior College during fiscal year 1979, four are summarized in this compilation which also contains a bibliography on non-traditional education in the two-year college setting. The first report presents, in three tables, a count of classes by time of day for the 1977, 1978, and 1979 Fall entry points. While the tables show similar room usage patterns, there was a slight decrease from 1978 to 1979. The second report outlines the results of a survey conducted in Fall 1978 to determine student attitudes towards the college's new Saturday class offerings. Selected findings indicate that students became aware of the new classes through signs on the campus, word of mouth, and the campus class schedule. Most students (71.3%) were enrolled in only one class, and 95% felt that class times were meeting their needs. The third report discusses the results of a survey of 21 instructors conducted in March, 1979, to determine their reactions to the newly designed "quad-pod" classrooms. The majority (61%) rated the "quad-pods" poor or very poor, complaining of too much noise and inadequate lighting. The final report outlines the results of a participant evaluation of a workshop that was held in April, 1979, to determine 1980 institutional goals. (JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED180512

INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Fiscal Year 1979

EVALUATIONS

Research Monographs II, IV, VII, X, and XIV

South Oklahoma City Junior College

1979

JC 790 620

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Annmarie Shirazi

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

I N T R O D U C T I O N

During fiscal year 1979, a number of research studies were carried out from which fourteen research monographs were written at intervals throughout the year to summarize the major institutional research projects undertaken. Within this document are the fourteen research monographs.

In the upcoming year, in addition to ongoing institutional research already underway, research studies in the following areas are under consideration:

1. *Retention studies will be expanded on students a) who stop out before completing a class, b) who skip one or more major entries, and c) who officially withdraw from school.*
2. *An extensive telephone community needs assessment.*
3. *A study to identify the reasons why students do not complete enrolling.*
4. *A look at our graduates to see who they are and what their pattern of attendance has been.*
5. *A new look at the perception of our revised grading system by those who deal with it.*

CLASSROOM USAGE FOR THE LAST THREE FALL ENTRIES

RESEARCH MONOGRAPH II

Office of Planning and Development
October, 1978

The information presented in Tables I, II, and III shows a count of classes (credit class only) for the last three fall entry points. The reported number of classrooms from which the percentages have been calculated do not include lab spaces or conference rooms although classes may be scheduled in conference rooms in the evening and those which are have been counted into the totals. (This is the reason that percentages are over 100% during evening hours.)

It appears that a similar pattern of room usage exists across the three entries. There is a slight decrease between 1978 and 1979 across the board. A small increase in afternoon classes on Friday can be seen in 1979. The heaviest usage is similar all three semesters, with 5:30--Monday through Thursday showing the greatest usage; late morning and evening--Monday through Thursday showing the second highest usage; and early afternoon--Monday through Thursday having the third highest usage time. The late afternoon still does not show any type of usage. It must be understood that the percentages do not deal with numbers of students but simply with the number of filled classrooms at any one time.

TABLE I

TOTAL ROOMS: 34

Entry 2 - Fiscal 1977

	MON	TUE	WED	THUR	FRI
8:00	1 - 2.9%	1 - 2.9%	1 - 2.9%	1 - 2.9%	1 - 2.9%
8:30	16 - 47.1%	2 - 5.9%	15 - 44.1%	2 - 5.9%	14 - 41.2%
9:00	16 - 47.1%	13 - 38.2%	15 - 44.1%	13 - 38.2%	14 - 41.2%
9:30	20 - 58.8%	13 - 38.2%	19 - 55.9%	13 - 38.2%	17 - 50.0%
10:00	20 - 58.8%	12 - 35.3%	19 - 55.9%	12 - 35.3%	17 - 50.0%
10:30	28 - 82.4%	20 - 58.8%	23 - 67.6%	20 - 58.8%	20 - 58.8%
11:00	28 - 82.4%	20 - 58.8%	23 - 67.6%	20 - 58.8%	20 - 58.8%
11:30	18 - 52.9%	17 - 50.0%	14 - 41.2%	17 - 50.0%	11 - 32.4%
12:00	17 - 50.0%	0 - 0%	14 - 41.2%	0 - 0%	11 - 32.4%
12:30	2 - 5.9%	0 - 0%	2 - 5.9%	0 - 0%	2 - 5.9%
1:00	8 - 23.5%	27 - 79.4%	8 - 23.5%	24 - 70.6%	4 - 11.8%
1:30	23 - 67.6%	28 - 82.4%	22 - 64.7%	24 - 70.6%	9 - 26.5%
2:00	23 - 67.6%	26 - 76.5%	22 - 64.7%	22 - 67.4%	9 - 26.5%
2:30	10 - 29.4%	11 - 32.4%	9 - 26.5%	5 - 14.7%	1 - 2.9%
3:00	6 - 17.6%	9 - 26.5%	5 - 14.7%	5 - 14.7%	
3:30	7 - 20.6%	7 - 20.6%	7 - 20.6%	5 - 14.7%	
4:00	7 - 20.6%	0 - 0%	7 - 20.6%	0 - 0%	
4:30	5 - 14.7%	0 - 0%	4 - 11.8%	0 - 0%	
5:00	2 - 5.9%	0 - 0%	1 - 2.9%	0 - 0%	
5:30	34 -100.0%	28 - 82.4%	24 - 70.6%	24 - 70.6%	
6:00	34 -100.0%	31 - 91.2%	26 - 76.5%	30 - 88.2%	
6:30	34 -100.0%	35 -102.5%	26 - 76.5%	34 -100.0%	
7:00	34 -100.0%	29 - 85.3%	26 - 76.5%	29 - 85.3%	
7:30	28 - 82.4%	25 - 73.5%	22 - 64.7%	25 - 73.5%	
8:00	24 - 70.6%	21 - 61.8%	13 - 38.2%	26 - 76.5%	
8:30	24 - 70.6%	21 - 61.8%	13 - 38.2%	26 - 76.5%	
9:00	22 - 64.7%	22 - 64.7%	13 - 38.2%	27 - 79.4%	
9:30	22 - 64.7%	19 - 55.9%	13 - 38.2%	24 - 70.6%	
10:00	17 - 50.0%	14 - 41.2%	11 - 32.4%	17 - 50.0%	
10:30	17 - 50.0%	14 - 41.2%	11 - 32.4%	17 - 50.0%	

TABLE II

Entry 2 - Fiscal 1978

TOTAL ROOMS: 39

	MON	TUE	WED	THUR	FRI
8:00	10 - 25.6%	11 - 28.2%	12 - 30.8%	12 - 30.8%	9 - 23.1%
8:30	11 - 28.2%	11 - 28.2%	12 - 30.8%	12 - 30.8%	10 - 25.6%
9:00	21 - 53.8%	13 - 33.3%	21 - 53.8%	13 - 33.3%	18 - 46.2%
9:30	21 - 53.8%	25 - 64.1%	21 - 53.8%	25 - 64.1%	18 - 46.2%
10:00	31 - 79.5%	26 - 66.7%	30 - 76.9%	25 - 64.1%	24 - 61.5%
10:30	31 - 79.5%	26 - 64.1%	30 - 76.9%	23 - 59.0%	24 - 61.5%
11:00	28 - 71.8%	18 - 46.2%	23 - 59.0%	18 - 46.2%	20 - 51.3%
11:30	27 - 69.2%	18 - 46.2%	22 - 56.4%	18 - 46.2%	20 - 51.3%
12:00	7 - 17.9%	18 - 46.2%	4 - 10.3%	17 - 43.6%	3 - 7.7%
12:30	6 - 15.4%	0 - 0%	4 - 10.3%	0 - 0%	3 - 7.7%
1:00	16 - 41.0%	1 - 2.6%	12 - 30.8%	1 - 2.6%	5 - 12.8%
1:30	17 - 43.6%	31 - 79.5%	13 - 33.3%	29 - 74.4%	6 - 15.4%
2:00	12 - 30.8%	32 - 82.1%	9 - 23.1%	29 - 74.4%	2 - 5.1%
2:30	10 - 25.6%	33 - 84.6%	8 - 20.5%	29 - 74.4%	2 - 5.1%
3:00	4 - 10.3%	11 - 28.2%	5 - 12.8%	12 - 30.8%	
3:30	4 - 10.3%	9 - 23.1%	5 - 12.8%	11 - 28.2%	
4:00	1 - 2.6%	8 - 20.5%	2 - 5.1%	10 - 25.6%	
4:30	1 - 2.6%	0 - 0%	2 - 5.1%	1 - 2.6%	
5:00	1 - 2.6%	0 - 0%	2 - 5.1%	1 - 2.6%	
5:30	39 - 100.0%	42 - 107.7%	39 - 100.0%	38 - 97.4%	
6:00	39 - 100.0%	42 - 107.7%	39 - 100.0%	42 - 107.7%	
6:30	39 - 100.0%	42 - 107.7%	38 - 97.4%	42 - 107.7%	
7:00	38 - 97.4%	42 - 107.7%	37 - 94.9%	39 - 100.0%	
7:30	34 - 87.2%	38 - 97.4%	35 - 89.7%	33 - 84.6%	
8:00	23 - 59.0%	29 - 74.4%	24 - 61.5%	26 - 66.7%	
8:30	23 - 59.0%	29 - 74.4%	24 - 61.5%	26 - 66.7%	
9:00	21 - 53.8%	29 - 74.4%	24 - 61.5%	26 - 66.7%	
9:30	19 - 48.7%	26 - 66.7%	23 - 59.0%	23 - 59.0%	
10:00	15 - 38.5%	20 - 51.3%	21 - 53.8%	18 - 46.2%	
10:30	15 - 38.5%	29 - 51.3%	21 - 53.8%	18 - 46.2%	

TABLE III

Entry 2 - Fiscal 1979

TOTAL ROOMS: 38

	MON	TUE	WED	THUR	FRI
8:00	8 - 21.1%	13 - 34.2%	8 - 21.1%	12 - 31.6%	7 - 18.4%
8:30	8 - 21.1%	13 - 34.2%	8 - 21.1%	12 - 31.6%	7 - 18.4%
9:00	25 - 65.8%	14 - 36.8%	21 - 55.3%	11 - 28.9%	19 - 50.0%
9:30	25 - 65.8%	26 - 68.4%	21 - 55.3%	22 - 57.9%	19 - 50.0%
10:00	31 - 81.6%	27 - 71.1%	27 - 71.1%	21 - 55.3%	25 - 65.8%
10:30	31 - 81.6%	26 - 68.4%	26 - 68.4%	21 - 55.3%	25 - 65.8%
11:00	20 - 52.6%	23 - 60.5%	19 - 50.0%	19 - 50.0%	18 - 47.4%
11:30	20 - 52.6%	22 - 57.9%	19 - 50.0%	18 - 47.4%	18 - 47.4%
12:00	7 - 18.4%	17 - 44.7%	4 - 10.5%	16 - 42.1%	1 - 2.6%
12:30	7 - 18.4%	0 - 0%	4 - 10.5%	0 - 0%	1 - 2.6%
1:00	12 - 31.6%	0 - 0%	9 - 23.7%	0 - 0%	3 - 7.9%
1:30	13 - 34.2%	19 - 50.0%	10 - 26.3%	18 - 47.4%	3 - 7.9%
2:00	14 - 36.8%	19 - 50.0%	10 - 26.3%	18 - 47.4%	3 - 7.9%
2:30	13 - 34.2%	18 - 47.4%	9 - 23.7%	17 - 44.7%	3 - 7.9%
3:00	7 - 18.4%	5 - 13.2%	5 - 13.2%	6 - 15.8%	0 - 0%
3:30	8 - 21.1%	6 - 15.8%	5 - 1..2%	5 - 13.2%	1 - 2.6%
4:00	5 - 13.2%	3 - 7.9%	2 - 5.3%	4 - 10.5%	1 - 2.6%
4:30	3 - 7.9%	2 - 5.3%	2 - 5.3%	2 - 5.3%	1 - 2.6%
5:00	1 - 2.6%	1 - 2.6%	0 - 0%	1 - 2.6%	
5:30	40 - 105.3%	36 - 94.7%	38 - 100.0%	36 - 94.7%	
6:00	40 - 105.3%	39 - 102.6%	38 - 100.0%	41 - 107.9%	
6:30	40 - 105.3%	39 - 102.6%	38 - 100.0%	41 - 107.9%	
7:00	39 - 102.6%	35 - 92.1%	37 - 97.4%	37 - 97.4%	
7:30	39 - 102.6%	34 - 89.5%	37 - 97.4%	37 - 97.4%	
8:00	24 - 63.2%	25 - 65.8%	22 - 57.9%	24 - 63.2%	
8:30	24 - 63.2%	25 - 65.8%	22 - 57.9%	24 - 63.2%	
9:00	24 - 63.2%	24 - 63.2%	22 - 57.9%	24 - 63.2%	
9:30	23 - 60.5%	23 - 60.5%	22 - 57.9%	24 - 63.2%	
10:00	23 - 60.5%	23 - 60.5%	22 - 57.9%	23 - 60.5%	
10:30	23 - 60.5%	23 - 60.5%	22 - 57.9%	23 - 60.5%	

SATURDAY CLASS EVALUATION

RESEARCH MONOGRAPH IV

Office of Planning and Development
December, 1978

This fall is the first semester that South Oklahoma City Junior College has offered classes on Saturdays A total of 24 classes were offered, and a total of 311 students enrolled. The time slots were constructed in order to make it possible for a student to carry two three-hour courses, each sixteen weeks, with one time period being from 8:30 a.m. to 10:55 a.m. and the other from 11:00 a.m. to 1:25 p.m.

During the ninth week of classes, a questionnaire was given to all students. A total of 122 completed questionnaires (39.2%) were returned. (A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Table I, and Table II contains a tally of all the responses made.) Basically, students became aware of Saturday classes through signs on campus, word of mouth, and the schedule. Seventy-one point three percent of the students were enrolled in only one class, and ninety-five point nine percent said class times were meeting their needs. The comment most often made was that it was great not to have to come to school after having worked all day.

When asked what other Saturday classes they would like, 10 people said none, and 12 said they would like general required courses in their particular program. A listing of all courses indicated and the number of times each was indicated can be found in Table II. When asked about services desired on Saturday, 57.4% of those responding felt that there was a need for increased services, the most common one being to have food service open for breakfast and snacks; the next most often identified need was to have the bookstore open.

At the same time as the questionnaires were being completed, each faculty person was asked to provide a list of students who were no longer attending classes on Saturdays. Students on this list will be contacted to determine why they stopped attending classes. This data will be distributed as an addition to this monograph when it is obtained.

TABLE I

SURVEY OF SATURDAY CLASSES

1. HOW DID YOU FIND OUT SOCJC IS HAVING SATURDAY CLASSES?

_____A) RADIO/TV

_____B) NEWSPAPER

_____C) MAILED SCHEDULE

_____D) SIGNS ON CAMPUS

_____E) WORD OF MOUTH

_____F) OTHER_____

_____

2. ARE YOU ENROLLED IN MORE THAN ONE SATURDAY CLASS?

_____YES _____NO

3. ARE THE CLASS TIMES AS CURRENTLY SCHEDULED MEETING YOUR NEEDS?

_____YES _____NO COMMENTS_____

_____

_____

4. WHAT OTHER SATURDAY CLASSES, IF OFFERED, WOULD YOU ENROLL IN?

_____

_____

_____

5. ARE THERE ANY SERVICES YOU WOULD LIKE OFFERED ON SATURDAY WHICH ARE NOT PRESENTLY OFFERED? _____YES _____NO

IF YES, WHAT? _____

_____

_____

TABLE II

RESPONSES TO SURVEY OF
SATURDAY CLASSES

N = 122

Question	Number Responding
1. How did you find out about Saturday classes?	
a. Radio/Television	7
b. Newspaper	6
c. Mailed Schedule	22
d. Signs on Campus	35
e. Word of Mouth	29
f. Other:	
1. Schedule	15
2. Instructor, Counselor, or Advisor	9
3. Class enrolled in changed to Saturday	2
4. Crossroads Display	2
5. Grandmother	1
6. Phone	1
2. Are you enrolled in more than one class?	
a. Yes	35
b. No	87
3. Are the class times meeting your needs?	
a. Yes	117
Comments:	
1. Great for people who work all week	6
2. Don't have to drive twice at night	3
3. Enjoyable and fit into schedule	2
4. Want more classes	2
5. Stupid idea	1
6. Want a longer term	1

Question	Number Responding
3. Continued	
b. No	5
Comments:	
1. Conflict with other duties	1
2. Greater time range	1
3. More general required courses	1
4. What other Saturday classes would you like?	
a. None	10
b. Whatever needed	7
c. General required courses	5
d. Specific courses:	
Natural and Applied Sciences	
Algebra	4
Auto Mechanics	1
Biology	1
Business Math	2
Finite Math	1
Engineering Drawing	1
Drafting and Design	2
Electronics	5
E+ 1204	4
Basic Math	5
Physics	1
Statistics	1
Tech Math II	1
Science classes	1
Physical Science	3
Human Affairs	
American Government	2
American History	2
Developmental Psychology	1
History	1
Psychology	3
Sociology	1
Western Civilization	1
Table Tennis	1
Physical Education	1
Disco Dancing	1
Intermediate Ballet	1

Question	Number Responding
4. Continued	
Allied Health	
Nursing	1
Business and Management	
ABC Stenoscript	1
Accounting I	5
Accounting II	10
Business	5
Business Communications	1
Bookkeeping I	2
Computer Science	2
Data Processing	1
Economics II	2
Introduction to Computers	1
Mid-Management Seminar	1
Income Tax Accounting	2
Introduction to American Business	2
Shorthand I	1
Shorthand II	4
Small Business	1
Real Estate	3
Programming	2
Marketing	1
Salesmanship	2
Media and Arts	
Acting	1
Art	1
Drawing	4
Lettering and Typography	3
Pottery	1
Speech and Communication	2
Speedwriting	2
Reading	1
Humanities	2
English	1
Composition	1
Composition and Literature	4
Color and Design	4
5. Other services desired on Saturday	
a. Bookstore open	15
b. More coffee and cups	7
c. Snack bar open for breakfast and snacks	30

Question	Number Responding
5. Continued	
d. Test centers open	6
e. Change machine	4
f. Child care	3
g. Game room open	1
h. Everything possible	1
i. Library open longer	2
j. More classes offered	1

"QUAD-POD" EVALUATION

RESEARCH MONOGRAPH VII

Office of Planning and Development
April, 1979

During the summer months in 1978, the area 1B4 was subdivided into four classrooms by the construction of two walls running diagonally across the square. Each of the four classrooms holds 35 students, has a small ceiling covering part of the room, has at least 12 feet of board space, and has lighting dropped from the area above with the lights in the ceiling portion able to be controlled with a switch in the area. The four classrooms quickly became nicknamed the "quad-pods."

In March, 1979, the twenty-one instructors who had taught in one of the "quad-pods" during the fall, 1978, or spring, 1979, were sent a questionnaire to try to identify their feelings about this new design. (See Table I.) Of the 21 faculty who received the questionnaire, 13 returned completed questionnaires (a 62% response rate).

The results indicated that a majority (61%) of those responding to the questionnaire felt the usefulness of the "quad-pod" was poor or very poor. The critism listed in the comment section dealt mainly with the fact that there were noise problems from both inside and outside, that there were lighting problems, and that the "quad-pod" was placed in the wrong area with the math lab and test center on one side and the biology labs on the other side. Table II contains a complete listing of all the general comments made. The questionnaire asked specific questions about the noise, the size, and the lighting in the four classroom areas. A majority of those responding (69%) felt the rooms should seat fewer students, and none felt they should seat more. In terms of noise, 61% said there was carry-over, but the noise carry-over was coming from the outside areas such as the labs and the test center, although noise from

audio-visual materials did apparently cause some noise problems between rooms. When asked about lighting problems, 85% indicated that always or sometimes there was a problem. This problem was caused mainly by the inability to turn lights off and the uneven lighting especially on the chalkboards. (See Table II for exact numbers.)

There apparently is a problem with the "quad-pods" but they could be eased by (1) moving the math lab and test center; (2) creating individual lighting for each "pod"; and (3) making the rooms hold fewer people (25 rather than 35).

TABLE I

EVALUATION OF THE QUAD-POD AREA

As a faculty member who taught in one of the quad-pods last semester (areas 1B4A, 1B4B, 1B4C, and 1B4D), would you please respond to this questionnaire and return it to area 1J2 as soon as possible? We are considering other similar changes and would very much like to get your input about the usefulness of such a design. Thanks.

1. Was there carry-over noise between the four classrooms?

_____NEVER _____SOMETIMES _____ALWAYS

If "sometimes," what was the cause?_____

_____

_____

2. Should the classroom have had:

_____MORE CHAIRS _____FEWER CHAIRS _____FINE AS IT WAS

3. Was the lighting a problem?

_____NEVER _____SOMETIMES _____ALWAYS

If "sometimes," when were there problems?_____

_____

_____

4. On a scale of 1 to 5 (with 1 being "very good" and 5 being "very poor"), how would you rate the quad-pods' usefulness?

1 2 3 4 5

GENERAL COMMENTS:_____

_____

_____

_____

TABLE II

QUESTION	RESPONDING No.	%
1) Was there carryover noise between the 2 classrooms?		
Never	1	8%
Sometimes	8	61%
Always	3	23%
2) Should the classroom have had:		
More Chairs	0	8%
Fewer Chairs	9	69%
Fine as it was	4	31%
3) Was the lighting a problem?		
Never	2	15%
Sometimes	5	39%
Always	6	46%
4) Rating of the Area		
1--Very Good	0	0%
2--	3	23%
3--	2	15%
4--	5	39%
5--Very Poor	3	23%

COMMENTS:

Rating	Comment
2	Low ceiling seemed to "trap" noises especially when lecturing while directly underneath.
2	Felt somewhat "closed in" with low overhang above blackboard. Otherwise, not bad.

COMMENTS (Continued):

Rating	Comment
2	Layout fine. 1B4D was subject to alot of distracting noises due to its location. Perhaps in other areas of the building, it would be okay.
3	Quad-pods should not have been sandwiched in between noisy areas as test center and lab.
3	It seemed to be just another classroom with no apparent benefit or faults.
4	Electricity is a problem, no outlets. There are light/dark spots on chalkboard. Seating needs to be rearranged to be compatible with the chalkboard. Make the rooms more regular in shape by rearranging the panels, openings should not be directly in the center but at the edge.
4	Seating is difficult because of the shape - openings permitted visual and auditory distractions. Not enough electrical outlets.
4	In highly concentrated areas like the quad pods, the rooms would be more efficient if they were enclosed like 1F-4 and others in the same area as 1F-4.
4	Electrical outlets are not placed properly for use of overhead projector, and there is not a place for a screen that doesn't occupy half the seating space or doesn't block view of students.
4	The quad is good from a space utilization point of view but poor from the students' point of view since they have to contend with so many negative factors in sound and lighting.
5	Design is poor, layout is poor. Class never really faces the board and there is no natural "front." Working from one end of the board to the other requires students to swivel about 120^{o}. Student complaints are numerous. Also, the areas trap noise from outside. Overall, forget this design and get professional design help.
5	Concentration of people and activities too high.
5	Poor acoustics in the classroom in addition to noise from outside and to outside. Seems to have incorporated most, if not all, of the poor traits of a room and a panel enclosed teaching area.

EVALUATION OF THE 1979 GOAL SETTING WORKSHOP

RESEARCH MONOGRAPH XIV

Office of Planning and Development
June, 1979

At the end of April, 1979, a workshop was held away from the campus in order to complete the development of goal statements from which the institutional goals for 1980 could be derived. All those who participated in the workshop were asked to complete a questionnaire which evaluated the activities and the accommodations. (See Table I.) Of the 25 people who attended the workshop, 21 people returned completed questionnaires, giving a 84% response rate.

Table II lists the responses made for each of the four questions with the comments made after each question listed at the end. All areas evaluated, except the goal setting portion, were rated between above average and excellent; the goal setting portion was rated between above average and average.

Comments appeared to indicate that there was not enough time to accomplish what was needed and that the time should be lengthened or travel time should be cut down. The accommodations, except for the lack of privacy and quiet in meeting rooms, were rated much better than many of the previous workshops. In terms of the evaluation of the goal setting portion, the comments showed that there was confusion about the process to be used to arrive at the end result. (This part of the evaluation has been used to identify a new system which will be used next year and should eliminate this problem.) Another critism made was that not enough time was allowed for the goal development process. The comments made about the speaker were mainly positive but again the lack of enough time was noted, with a number of requests being made for her to return for a longer period of time.

The goals which were identified at this workshop are now with the Executive Cabinet which will use them to develop the final institutional goals for fiscal 1980.

TABLE I

April 26 & 27, 1979
WORKSHOP EVALUATION

Please complete the following questions about the workshop and return to the box in 1J2 by Monday, May 7, 1979.

1) What would be your overall evaluation of this workshop?

___Excellent ___Above Average ___Average ___Below Average ___Poor

Comment:

2) How would you rate the rooms and accommodations?

___Excellent ___Above Average ___Average ___Below Average ___Poor

Comment:

3) How would you evaluate the goal setting portion (Thursday) of this workshop?

___Excellent ___Above Average ___Average ___Below Average ___Poor

Comment:

4) How would you evaluate the speaker?

___Excellent ___Above Average ___Average ___Below Average ___Poor

Comments:

TABLE II

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTION	RATING					AVERAGE RATING
	EXCELLENT	ABOVE AVERAGE	AVERAGE	BELOW AVERAGE	POOR	
1) Overall Evaluation	4	13	4	0	0	2.00
2) Rooms and Accommodations	6	10	5	0	0	1.95
3) Goal Setting Evaluation	2	9	8	2	0	2.48
4) Speaker Evaluation	4	11	5	1	0	2.14

Comments after Question 1:

1. Seemed to lack substance, a direction.
2. Schedule too tight.
3. Quit too early on Friday.
4. Need more privacy for meetings. Movable partitions at State Lodges allow too much noise and other distractions. I question one day of travel for a one-day meeting. I think we should "get out of town" but closer to OKC.

Comments after Question 2:

1. Best we've had.
2. I thoroughly enjoyed the setting.
3. Best yet.
4. Quite a few distractions, but overall just fine.

Comments after Question 3:

1. There appeared to be conflicts as to the purpose of the activity.
2. Maybe too little time, especially with relative lack of specific directions, guidelines, etc.
3. The best we have had.
4. Looked like disaster until Dale intervened.
5. Too much direction from the President, especially before beginning group work.
6. Although possibly additional time would have been desirable for discussion, I felt it was well planned to reach end results very quickly.

7. *Too little opportunity to discuss concerns and develop recommended goals. Leaders were somewhat unclear as to procedure for developing final outcomes.*

8. *Needed more time - too much direction was given by the president. We knew what goals we were to come up with without looking at the concerns.*

Comments after Question 4:

1. *Should have scheduled prior to goal setting portion to permit practice of assertive training.*

2. *Probably hampered by trying to put a several days' workshop into just a few hours. Might be interesting to have her for a longer period.*

3. *The material covered was very good. I would like to learn more.*

4. *Material was interesting but not of great value.*

5. *Had practical ideas for improved communication. Would like to hear more from her.*

6. *Pleasantly pleased with presentation after predetermined biases.*

7. *We need to set up an ongoing program for all employees that interact with students or public.*

8. *I've heard worse, but she depended on personality to make her points.*

9. *Please have follow up workshop with her leadership.*

A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF CURRENT ARTICLES AND BOOKS ON NONTRADITIONAL EDUCATION IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

RESEARCH MONOGRAPH X

Office of Planning and Development
June, 1979

In an attempt to help in the dissemination of current information on many facets of community college education, the Research Office will produce an annotated bibliography of books, journal articles, and other documents in various areas of community/junior college educational activities. Where possible, ERIC numbers will be included to help with the retrieval of the original article. This first attempt will deal with the consideration of nontraditional education in the two-year college setting. The information below has been obtained through an ERIC documents' search.

Bushnell, David S. Organizing for Change: New Priorities for Community Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

> *Reports the views of students, faculty, and presidents at 92 community/junior colleges on the long-range goals to be served by two-year colleges; discusses the discrepancies between desired goals and the present situation; identifies social and economic trends likely to influence the future direction of two-year colleges during this decade; and sets forth a set of strategies for systematically narrowing the gap between goals and current practices.*

The Chicago City-Wide Institute of the City Colleges of Chicago. Unpublished paper, 1975. 43p. ED 124 227.

> *Describes the Chicago City-Wide Institute, a noncampus college established in 1974 as the ninth administrative unit of the City Colleges of Chicago. The basic mission of the Institute is to develop and operate programs at the college level for adults who cannot or choose not to go to a traditional college campus. The Open Learning Division serves minority and other nontraditional students utilizing self-paced media delivery systems and an open entry-open exit, competency-based format. The Division of Continuing Education and Community Services offers job-related courses, courses related to the handicapped, courses for older adults, public issues courses, and community education activities. The Center for Student Development provides counseling and assessment of life/work experiences for college credit.*

Gould, Samuel B. Community Colleges and Non-Traditional Study. Unpublished paper, 1971. 18p. ED 060 832.

A discussion of the reasons why community colleges have a unique but undeveloped opportunity in the area of non-traditional study. Seventeen societal needs to be fulfilled by the community colleges are listed.

Gross, Ronald. "A Solution Whose Problem Has Arrived: Technology for Nontraditional Study Educational Technology Revisited: Profile 9." Planning for Higher Education, Vol. 4, No. 5, pp. 9-15, October 1975.

Highlights of "Designing Diversity '75," a conference on Open Learning and Nontraditional Study. Focus is on serving adult learners through technology-based learning systems.

Hall, Laurence, and Associates. New Colleges for New Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Describes the innovations developed by several different colleges. These institutions go where the people are, to meet specific and pragmatic needs - those of urban blue-collar youth, women who are isolated from the mainstream of higher education, rural young people, and working adults.

Hencey, Robert E., and Zeiger, Dinah. "And Now for Something Completely Different." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 46, No. 8, pp. 16-17, May 1976.

The history of Pioneer Community College (Kansas City, Mo.) is described, as is its modular, competency-based innovative curriculum. The college has no campus, no set curriculum, and no full-time faculty.

Leppert, William, and Koenig, Joan. "Alpha - College for Exploring." Community College Frontiers, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 14-17, Summer 1976.

Describes Alpha, the experimental college of individualized instruction at the College of DuPage (Illinois). At this college, students design their own curricula and work in an open classroom situation, while teachers start with students rather than disciplines.

Lombardi, John. Noncampus Colleges: New Governance Patterns for Outreach Programs. Topical Paper No. 60. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, 1977.

An update report on noncampus colleges from Vermont to Washington state. Although varying widely, these institutions share a concern for student needs, diversity and individual opportunity.

Martin, Edwin P. "Innovative Programs and Curricula." New Directions for Higher Education, Vol. 3, No. 4, pp. 23-32, Winter 1975.

A summary of curricular innovations such as career education, experiential education, competency-based education, interdisciplinary courses, independent study, and calendar change. Discusses reasons for resistance to such innovations.

Park, Young. "A Conceptual Basis for Nontraditional Study." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 46, No. 6, pp. 29-31, 76, March 1976.

The development of a nontraditional system of education, in addition to maintaining the existing operation, may be the best solution to the economic and enrollment problems facing junior colleges today. This article identifies the elements that influence the development of nontraditional educational services, and suggests modes of implementation.

Parsons, Michael H. Meeting the Challenge of Change. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C., March 18, 1976. 14 p. ED 121 389.

Presents a case study of how Hagerstown Junior College (Maryland) has adjusted its curriculum to meet the challenges presented by the "new" student, the needs of of the community, and the need for institutional self-renewal. HJC has adopted a modularized, audio-tutorial, contractual (MATC) system of instruction. This system uses diagnostic pretesting, a variety of learning experiences and instructional media, and a formal system for setting behavioral objectives.

Voegel, George H. (Ed.) Using Instructional Technology. New Directions for Community Colleges, Vol. 3, No. 1, Spring 1975.

Discusses use of modules, audiotutorials, individualized learning contracts; learning via television and telephone; use and expansion of the learning resources center. Extensive bibliography is included.

Next month you may look forward to receiving some information on current literature in the area of attrition and retention in the community college.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
96 Powell Library Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024

JAN 25 1980